



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,888	09/12/2003	Mohamad El-Batal	LSI.81US01 (03-1078)	6950
24319	7590	10/09/2007	EXAMINER	
LSI CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			CHERY, MARDOCHEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/660,888		EL-BATAL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mardochee Chery		2188	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mardochee Chery. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Samuel M. Freund, Reg. No. 30,459. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1, 9, and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Burns (6,088,694) and Schneider (2002/0049883).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative points out how in the system of Burns, "though a delta file A2 is created, file A1 remains linked and delta file A2 is simply a backed up version of a portion of an existing file, and Burns is merely comparing two co-existing, stored and linked files in order to generate a delta file" while in applicant's claimed invention "the delta log is started concurrent with the step of removing a failed storage unit and the delta log stores changes or data that would have been otherwise stored on the removed/failed storage unit". Applicant's representative further mentions how in Schneider a second hard disk is provided along with a main disk and the second disk is suspended/removed not the main disk and that data stored in the second disk is data moving backward to more distant times and does not include changes from where a disk was being removed". Applicant should amend independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to include limitations similar to "the delta log starts when a failed storage unit is removed and that the delta log stores data that would have been otherwise stored on the failed/removed storage unit and the changes stored in the delta log are not stored in another one of the storage units". to help clarify the claim language and better express the inventive aspect. Applicant should also point out where support for each amended claim features is found in the original disclosure.